

101 E. Wanda,
Garland, Texas
Feb. 15, 1964.

Mr. William J. Alexander,
Assistant District Attorney,
Dallas, Texas.

Dear Mr. Alexander:

Attorney Jonahill said that they would want to know if a prospective juror was prejudiced against Fullerton because of his religion or his association with strippers. Well, there are several things to say about the remark. (1) It is a fact that ~~most~~ the non-Evangelical Jews, like Fullerton was, are lost, and ~~have~~ knowledge of a fact does not prejudice people. Prejudice means, to judge before having the facts. (2) He was not only associated with strippers, but he ran a strip-tease business. (3) It is a fact that such a business is immoral; and knowledge of a fact, like I have already shown, cannot

25-61

prejudice people. (4) A Law of God teaches that either you are against rejectors of Christ or you are against acceptors of Christ. Jesus said, "Either you are with me, or you are against me." A non-Evangelical juror is infinitely more apt to make prejudgments (which is the definition of prejudice) than are Evangelicals.

Mr. Jonchill said, "We intend to examine prospective jurors' conscious, subconscious, and unconscious thoughts." There is no such a thing as ^{an} unconscious thought. The concept is self-contradictory. The Psychological concept of the unconscious mind is repugnant to the word of God in the Bible. There ~~may be~~ ^{is} such a thing as the subconscious; but it ~~more~~ ^{is} never essentially different from the conscious, but is only a lesser degree of consciousness. It is what St. Paul was talking about when he said, "In this earthly life, we oftentimes see through a glass darkly." The subconscious is what we know deep

down in our hearts, or it is what we know "in the back of our heads" (to use a popular expression). Many times, when one fears that God might not have forgiven him of a sin, he has sufficient knowledge in his subconscious mind that God has forgiven him. So don't let Jonah's influence ~~to~~ ^{not} to think that Rullenstein could have consciously been a keeper of the law and subconsciously a breaker of the law.

I don't need to know the specific things the 3 psychiatrists have to say about the recent examination of Rullenstein's brain. All I need to know is that men, like Rullenstein, are declared to be insane only by means of the modern concept of insanity, which is ^{concept} totally heretical, or repugnant to the word of God in the Bible, and that no insanity compels a person to kill the Bible. All of the criteria which are used by modern psychiatry are heresies, and I can point out about

Professor Louis L. Jaffe, of Harvard University Law School, made a speech at the University of Texas Law School. And in this speech he said that it may be that we will have to have a judicial policing of the press, to prevent the press from printing statements which interfere with a fair trial. But ~~any judicial policing of the press is a violation of the standards of the people because this is a government by the people. Because the people believe in the right to free this is a government by the people.~~ Nothing in the Constitution is more nearly absolute than is the ^{guarantee of the} right to free. The people are the Court of last resort, next to Christianity. Next to Christianity, the people are to decide as to whether some news reports interfere with a fair trial. A judicial policing of the press, which is ~~conflicting with the~~ ^{is a violation of the} ~~standards of the people~~ ^{standards of the people}, would be like a police dictatorship or something like a police state set-up. Of course, judges would have to be involved in the policing of the press,

~~St. Helen Public makes a circus out of~~
~~St. Helen & makes a circus out of a trial~~
~~trials, like the Harvard law professors~~
~~intertypes too much with justice, just~~
~~and it does the people can say it~~
~~would be against the law and the right~~
~~to go to get a step to the and not~~
~~to pay of 10,000 more valuable than an~~
~~attorney's fee.~~
~~a circus out of a trial.~~

James C. Hagerly said that the press has been abusing its privilege at times. But the freedom of the press is not a privilege, it is a right. The freedom of ^{speech} expression is more apt to be a ^{mere} privilege than is the freedom of the press. This freedom of right of the press is called the right to know.

Legal experts cannot get by with
with policing the press, in spite of
what the people think about the matter,
so long as the people have the
power to impeach legal experts.

Of course, a government by the people, unconditionally is repugnant to the word of God in the Bible. But until Christianity influences our country to cease to have a government by the people, it will continue to control legal exports.

When this country starts letting

experts be the Court of last resort, the according to what the word of God in the Bible says about the matter, ~~the experts~~ ~~Pitts says about the matter, the experts~~ will be preachers, and not secular lawyers. But I doubt that the Harvard law professor was advocating this kind of ~~expert~~ ~~ulterior~~ ultimate expertise.

Mr. Hegerly said that Dallas police should have barred the press from the police station after the shooting of President Kennedy, ~~on the argument~~ ^{and} that police spokesmen could have come outside and made a report ~~about~~ about the case. But that, ~~like~~ ^{if} would have been ungodly, unconstitutional, and a police-state system. ~~It~~ would have been ungodly, because Jesus said, "Nothing shall I hid that shall not be revealed.... What is said in secrecy will be hauled from the house top." And the Fundamental Christian doctrine of individualism teaches that every individual has the right to know, ~~and~~ since any individual can recognize and expose

injustice, as well as a billion people can.

Sincerely yours,
Rev. Cecil Greenham.

P.S. Attorney Melvin Belli ^{Belli} ~~said~~ was asked on T.V. if he would try to prove Rubenstein was insane. And Belli answered, "not in these words, but we will just enter a plea of not guilty." But Belli cannot get by with the ^{criminal justice} ~~business~~ of using some term which would connote an association of sanity with insanity. Because I know that God won't let him get by with it at the Court of last resort, and I am confident that the Dallas prosecution won't let him get by with it. There is an infinite difference between sanity and insanity. ~~Only on a plea of insanity or on the argument that there~~

There are only 2 pleas which Belli could enter at the trial. (1) The plea that there is a Christian law which is above the law that Rubenstein committed murder, and that Christian law would make Rubenstein not guilty. And (2) The plea of insanity.

in light of what I have already said about ^{8.}
Psychiatry, psychiatrists are some of the most unqualified

~~psychiatrists are, the most unqualified~~
~~superior of, or judges of, a brain~~
~~examination. of the report which~~
~~the Dallas news reporter gave of~~
~~the brain examination that~~
~~corrected them. it is incredible that~~
~~been correct, the 3 psychiatrists in 3 days~~
~~not have waited until now to say so.~~

Mr. Imahell also said he would
want to know what the prospective
jurors thought about President Kennedy.
But if any one assumes that ~~the~~ the
president of the U.S. is a good man,
unconditionally, he is committing
blasphemy or ~~is~~ is advocating the
belief in a Godless humanism. Any
juror who, ~~is~~ ^{was} ~~is~~ for Kennedy
would be as apt to be prejudiced
for Reuther as a ~~juror~~ ^{juror} who was
against Kennedy would be apt to be
against the ~~juror~~

~~prejudiced~~

prejudices against the ~~juror~~
~~since all of the formed Christians~~
~~since no Evangelical would be about~~
~~was against the ~~juror~~ Christ~~
~~his attitude toward Kennedy, all possible~~

would, consequently ^{he} prejudices ² for Jack
~~about their passion for Jack~~
~~Ruthenstern's brother, who, it would be~~
~~resolute down to the defense's saying, "The court must choose~~
~~my prejudices, rather than any body~~
~~else's prejudices." How - impartial a~~
~~jury like that would be!~~

A woman said ~~she~~ it was an-
 nounced on T.V. that Ruthenstern ac-
 cepted Jesus Christ. If that is true,
 and the truth is known, then he should
 not have to receive more punishment
 than 2 years in the penitentiary.
~~If they don't have to give a reward~~
~~for rejecting a prophet, they could~~
~~reject a prophet, just because he~~
~~says that Jesus' Evangelical preachers were false.~~
~~Being detectives, given the man~~
~~whom it was said that he had shot the~~
 man the former saw shoot Oswald
 is proof that the defender supplied
 at the trial is the real killer.

C.S.G.